CHAPTER IV.

KRISHNARĀJA WODEYAR II, 1734-1766.

The *Dalavai Regime* in Mysore, 1734-1759: Birth, accession, etc., of Krishnaraja—Character of the new government—Political affairs: General tendencies and factors—*First Phase*: 1734-1739: Mysorean advance on Malabar and the South, 1735-1737—Relations with the Mughals: Mughal advance on the South, 1732-1736—Mysore, the objective of the Mughals, 1736—Their advance on Seringapatam, *c.* September-December 1736—Action at Kailancha, January 1737; Mughal reverses—Internal affairs, 1734-1739—*Second Phase*: 1739-1746—Retrospect of affairs: The Mughals and the Mahrattas in South India, 1737-1740—The Mahratta conquest of Trichinopoly, 1740-1741—Deccan and Karnatak politics, 1741-1744; Renewed Mughal-Mahratta struggles—The Hindu cause in Southern India (from 1736)—The Mahratta conquest of Trichinopoly (1741) and after—Trichinopoly, the southern objective of Mysore, *c.* 1735-1745—Mysore and Malabar, 1745-1746—*Third Phase*: 1746-1748—General political situation, 1745-1748—Karachuri Nanjarajaiya's expedition to Dharanagar, *c.* May-July 1746—His siege of Devanahalli, *c.* August 1746-April 1747—Renewed Mughal advance on Mysore; Nasir Jang in Seringapatam, July-October 1747—The short-lived Hindu reaction in Southern India, 1748.

THE *coup de grace* of June 10, 1734 resulted in making Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya practically—master of the situation in Seringapatam. With a view ostensibly to promote the interests of the Ruling House of Mysore but really to ensure the predominance of himself and of other members of the Kaḷale Family over the administration of the State, he next represented with

The *Daḷavāi Rēgime* in Mysore, 1734-1759.

affected humility to the dowager queen Dēvājamma, the desirability of bringing about the succession of the six-year old child (*b.* 1728) of her kinsman Chāme Urs of Chikkanahaḷḷi, whom she had adopted under the name of Chikka-Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar as early as October 8, 1731.[1] Having secured her formal consent to his proposal, Dēvarājaiya had the heir-elect brought with royal honours to Seringapatam and installed him on the throne of Mysore on June 15, 1734 (*Ānanda, Jyēṣṭha ba.* 10),[2] the fifth day after the deposition of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar. The new ruler thus chosen to fill the place of Chāmarāja is generally known in the chronicles as Immaḍi-Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar (Krishṇaṇarāja Woḍeyar II) and more familiarly as Chikka-Krishnarāja Woḍeyar. Inscriptions and literary works, however, only mention him as Krishṇarāja, the earliest record referring to him as such being a copper-plate charter from the Salem district, dated in 1734 (*s.* 1656).[3]

Birth accession, etc., of Krishṇarāja.

1. *Annals*, I. 172-173. The date of birth of Krishṇarāja, according to this source, is *Kīlaka* (1728). Wilks (I. 255-256) refers to the successor of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar as "Chick Kishen Raj," and speaks of him as "an infant of a younger branch." The *Mys. Rāj. Cha.* (37) vaguely refers to Immaḍi-Krishṇarāja as a son of dowager queen Dēvājamma of Kaḷale. The *Rāj. Kath.* (XII. 489), however, is to some extent in agreement with the *Annals* when it mentions him as her five-year old adopted son. Compare also S. K. Aiyangar (*Ancient India*, p. 308) who merely refers to the nomination of "an infant three years old." The authority of the *Annals* is, as usual, preferred here as the more specific on the accession question.
2. *Ibid*, 173. The *Mys. Rāj. Cha.* (l.c.) speaks of the installation of Krishṇarāja on June 10, 1734 (*Ānanda, Jyēṣṭha ba.* 5), *i.e.*, on the same day as Chāmarāja's deposition by Dēvarājaiya. This is impossible unless we take it to refer to the formal accession. In the troubled conditions in which the Royal household found itself by the deposition, Krishṇarāja's installation must be held to have actually taken place after a short interval of four days, in keeping with the *Annals*. The *Rāj. Kath.* (l.c.) tacitly assumes that the accession came off in 1734; Wilks (l.c.) places it roughly in 1734, and S. K. Aiyangar (*o.c.*, p. 309) also adopts the same position.
3. See *I. M. P.*, II. 1226, Sa. 202. For details about the document, *vide* under *Grants and other records* in Ch. XII.

Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar II, 1731-1766.

Character of the new government.

Throughout the greater part of Krishṇarāja's reign—both during and after his minority—the affairs of the State, under the arrangements effected by Dēvarājaiya, were, in general, conducted by the latter himself as *Daḷavāi* (1734-1758),[4] in collaboration with his cousin brother Nanjarājaiya III as *Sarvādhikāri* (1734-1739)[5] and his own younger brother Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya IV,[6] at first possibly as a colleague of his (1734-1739) and afterwards as *Sarvādhikāri* and junior *Daḷavāi* (1739-1759)—the three brothers being assisted by Venkaṭapataiya, a Brāhman of Kannambāḍi (*Kaṇvapuri*) as *Pradhān* under them (1734-1755).[7] Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya held, in addition, the charge of the principality of Kaḷale also (1735-1758), in succession to Chaluvaiya (1719-1735).[8] All real power in Mysore during 1734-1759 was wielded by these members of the Kaḷale Family, whence the period becomes conspicuous in the politics of the

4. *Annals*, I. 174; see also and compare *Wilks*, I. 256-257, and S. K. Aiyangar, *o.c.*, p. 308. Wilks (I. 257) speaks of Dēvarājaiya ("Deo-Raj") as "being upwards of fifty" in 1734. For further references to Dēvarājaiya and his colleagues in contemporary sources, *vide* Chs. VI-XIII. For the genealogical position of the members of the Kaḷale Family, *vide* Tables XI-XIII.

5. Wilks (I. 256) writes of Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya ("Nunjeraj") as having been "in the vigour of middle life" in 1734.

6. Referred to as "Nandi Raj, Dalaway," etc., in the *Fort St. George Records* and other foreign sources for the period 1751-1761 (cited in Chs. VI-XI). Wilks (I. 257) speaks of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya ("Kerachoory Nunjeraj") as "of about thirty years of age" in 1734. We have no means of knowing the exact official position of this Nanjarājaiya during the reigns of Krishṇarāja I (1714-1732) and Chāmarāja VI (1732-1734), although, as the younger brother of Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya, he appears to have wielded considerable power and influence under them. *Karāchūri* literally means the hand and dagger, and denotes a word and a blow according to the English proverbial idiom (*Wilks*, I. 257, f.n.). It is an epithet pointing to Nanjarājaiya as a man of dashing spirit and positive expressions, which profoundly impressed his European contemporaries (see, for instance, in Chs. VI-VIII). Cf. Wilks's characterization of him (I. 257).

7. Wilks (I. 256) refers to him as "Vencataputty of Caniam baddy, Perdhan." For particulars of Venkaṭapati's genealogy, etc., *vide* Ch. XIII.

8. *K. A. V.*, ff. 33; also Table XIII.

kingdom as the *Daḷavāi Règime*. The interests of Kaḷale in the court of Mysore were, as usual, further strengthened by the marriage of Dēvājamma, daughter of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya, to Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar in 1746 when he attained his majority.[9]

Political affairs: General tendencies and factors.

The period of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar's reign in Mysore (1734-1766) is for the most part synchronised by a most momentous epoch in the history of Southern India during the decline and fall of the Mughal Empire.[10] Under the nominal rule of Muhammad Shah (1719-1748) and his successors at Delhi, the Nizām, as the imperial representative of the Mughals, was becoming virtual master of the Deccan and the Karnāṭak. Both during and after the rule of Shāhu at Satāra (1708-1749), the Mahrattas under Pēshwas Bājī Rao I (1720-1740) and Bālāji Bāji Rao (1740-1761) were dominating the political situation from Poona, their imperialistic designs in India being a source of anxiety to the Nizām. The Nawābs of Arcot and Sīra in the Karnāṭak, theoretically subject to the suzerainty of the Nizām, were more or less independent, levying contributions from the country powers within their immediate jurisdiction. Among these, however, the kingdom of Ikkēri, under Sōmaśēkhara Nāyaka II (1715-1739) and his successors, held her own, though exposed to constant Mahratta attacks. In the far south, the kingdoms of Madura and Tanjore were being torn asunder by internal dissensions, the former, in the throes of her dissolution, offering a tempting ground to the ambitions of the Nawāb of Arcot. Civil

9. See under *Domestic life*, in Ch. XIII. Wilks also (I. 260) makes mention of this marriage.

10. *Vide*, for general references on this section, Briggs, *The Nizam* (Vol. I); Duff, *History of the Marathas* (Vol. I); Kincaid and Parasnis, *History of the Maratha People* (Vol. III); *C. H. I.* (Vol. V); Wilks, *Mysoor* (Vol. I); *Ke. N. V.* (Chs. X-XII); Satyanatha Aiyar, *Nāyaks of Madura* (Ch. XIV); *Tanjore Dist. Gaz.* (Vol. I); Burhan's *Tuzak-i-Wālājāhi* (Part I), etc.

wars and disputed successions were the order of the day, and there was a general scramble for power in the Karnāṭak and South India as between the Nawāb, the Mahrattas and the Nizām. The situation became complicated by the Anglo-French commercial rivalry in India. In particular, the tendency of these European nations to take part and intervene in the affairs of local powers—a tendency which, as we have shown, seemed to manifest itself for the first time in Malabar in 1733—became more pronounced from 1748 onwards, especially during the period covered by the governorship of M. Dupleix, Godeheu and de Leyrit at Pondicherry (1742-1759), and of Thomas Saunders (1750-1755) and George Pigot (1755-1763) at Madras, and by the Indian careers of their Company's generals like La Bourdonnais and Law, de Bussy and Lally, Boscawen and Robert Clive, Stringer Lawrence and Coote (1746-1761).

First phase: 1734-1739.

Mysorean advance on Malabar and the South, 1735-1737.

During the early years of Krishṇarāja's reign, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya had had to direct his attention to the affairs of Malabar. Hostilities between the Prince of Cotata and Sōmaśēkhara Nāyaka II of Ikkēri continued unabated, ever since the return of the Mysore troops from Malabar to Seringapatam (April 1734) under the humiliating circumstances detailed in the last chapter. About May 1735—towards the close of the very first year of Krishṇarāja's accession—a contingent of the Mysore army, consisting of two to three thousand horse and more than twenty thousand foot, advanced on Malabar,[11] probably by way of retaliation. The troops entered the Zāmorin's territory and between May and July reduced a considerable portion of it, meeting little opposition

11. *Telli. Cons.* (1734-1735), pp. 81-82: *Consultations* dated May 8 and 19, 1735; see also and compare *Letters. Telli.* (1734-1736), p. 13: *Letter* dated June 16, 1735.

from him.[12] By November, they had proceeded as far as Penany in the west and the kingdom of Madura in the south.[13] The incursions of Mysore in these regions continued to be active till about the middle of 1736,[14] and there seemed prospects of her being secretly induced to rejoin the Prince of Cotata against Ikkēri in 1736-1737,[15] when affairs of more immediate concern began directly to press on the kingdom of Mysore.

Relations with the Mughals:

Mughal advance on the South, 1732-1736.

As indicated in the preceding chapter, since 1732, there prevailed considerable distraction in the Karnāṭak and South India. The kingdom of Madura in the far south, in particular, was passing through troubled times under Mīnākshi, queen and successor of Vijayaranga-Chokkanātha (1706-1732).[16] On the death of the latter without issue in 1732, Mīnākshi adopted a boy named Vijaya-Kumāra, coming from a collateral branch of the Nāyaka family of Madura; and attempted to secure popular recognition of her rule. She was, however, opposed by Bangāru-Tirumala, father of the adopted son, and Daḷavāi Venkaṭāchārya, who

12. *Ibid.*

13. *Letters. Telli.* (1734-1736), p. 29: *Letter* dated November 17, 1735 *Penany*: Identified with Ponnāny (from *Pon*-gold; *nāṇyam*-coin, the Arabic cash which was first circulated by Arab and Iranian merchants); situated at the mouth of the Ponnāny river, the longest river which discharges into the Arabian Sea in Malabar proper; taluk head-quarters, 186 miles S. W. of Bangalore; important sea-port between Cochin and Calicut; nearest port to Pālghāṭ gap; once proposed terminus of Madras Railway; the Moplah high priest lives here; centre of Muhammadan education on the west coast, possessing a religious college which confers degrees; the population supports itself by fishing and trade, having numerous *puttimars* which ply to Sūrat, Arabia, Bombay, Madras and even as far as Bengal, exporting principally pepper, betel, rice, cocoanuts, iron and very fine timber sent down the river from the *ghāṭs*. The Ponnāny taluk is the southernmost in the Malabar district.

14. *Letters from Fort St. George* (1736), pp. 51-52; *Letter* No. 80, dated September 6, 1736; see also *Telli. Cons.* (1737-1738) p. 52: *Consultation* dated December 26, 1737.

15. See *Telli. Cons.* (1737-1738), p. 111: *Consultation* dated May 20, 1738.

16. *Vide*, on this section, *Nāyaks of Madura*, pp. 232-234; *Wilks*, I. 271-273; *C. H. I.*, V. 117; *Haid. Nām.* (1784), ff. 3, and *Tuzak.* (1781), pp. 6-73, 82. See also f.n. 35 and 69 *infra*.

formed an alliance to depose her. Meantime, in the Karnāṭak, Nawāb Sādatullā Khān (1708-1733) died, and was succeeded by his nephew Alī Dōst Khān (1733-1740) to the Mughal Nizāmat of Arcot. In 1734, about a year after his accession, Nawāb Alī Dōst Khān, ostensibly to intercede on behalf of Mīnākshi (who is said to have sought his help) but really to reduce the kingdoms of Madura and Tanjore, despatched an army to the south under his only son Safdar Alī and one of his sons-in-law Chandā Sāhib (Husain Dōst Khān). The forces marched on to Trichinopoly, where, after protracted negotiations, Chandā swore by the *Korān* to safeguard the interests of Mīnākshi as ruler of Madura and guarantee her undisputed possession of Trichinopoly in return for, it is said, a crore of rupees promised by her. The queen having, however, in the meanwhile formally reconciled herself with Bangāru-Tirumala, sent him and his son to Madura; and Safdar Alī and Chandā Sāhib returned to Arcot. In due course, the faction kept up by Bangāru against the queen became more active, and Chandā Sāhib had to pay a second visit to Trichinopoly early in 1736. He treacherously usurped all power, capturing Mīnākshi. The latter, disappointed, took poison and died; Nāyaka rule in Madura became extinct, and Bangāru sought refuge in Śivaganga. Master of Trichinopoly, Chandā took possession of Madura and Diṇḍigal, placing two of his brothers, Sādak Sāhib and Baḍē Sāhib (Zainullābdīn Khān), over those places. By the middle of 1736, the authority of the Nawāb of Arcot—as a Mughal representative, independent of the Nizām—seemed to extend over a greater part of Southern India, with the exception of Mysore.

Mysore, the objective of the Mughals, 1736.

Mysore had remained a thorn in the side of the Nawāb. During 1735-1736, her army was, as we have seen, active in Malabar and the south, and was even

engaged with the kingdom of Madura,[17] apparently taking advantage of the internal dissensions there under Mīnākshi. Partly alarmed by these movements and partly attracted as usual by the imagined riches of Mysore, Nawāb Alī Dōst Khān concerted an attack on her about August 1736, and moved on with his forces thither early in September.[18] The weakness and frivolity of the then Nawāb of Sīra, Tāhir Khān, who asserted a nebulous claim to extort contributions from Mysore, also contributed to this end.[19]

Their advance on Seringapatam, *c.* September-December 1736.

The invading army, an exceptionally large one,[20] was in the main commanded by two brothers by name Khāsīm Khān and Murād Khān.[21] Between September-December 1736, it passed through the Karnāṭak-Pāyanghāṭ, ravaging the countryside and

17. *Vide* letter cited in f.n. 13 *supra*.

18. *Letters from Fort St. George* (1736), I.c.; see also and compare *Wilks*, I. 257.

19. *Wilks*, I. 257-258. These "contributions" sought to be levied and "*pēshkāsh*" demanded had behind them no lawful right to justify them. Neither the right of conquest nor the right created by agreement as evidenced by a treaty was, or could be, invoked in favour of them. They were wholly predatory in character and often the payment, if any actually made, was a payment made to buy off an inconvenient disturber of the peace of the country, who had no other objective but to obtain some booty, if he could, from the countries through which he passed. It is necessary to note this fact, as the indiscriminate use of words of this kind—"contribution," "tribute," "*pēshkāsh*," etc.,—in some of the older writers has a tendency to create impressions of political subordination as between the States claiming and paying them, which are far from being correct. The fundamental point is that the Mysoreans, the Mahrattas and the Mughal representative (real or so-called) were each of them fighting for supremacy in the South during this period and they asserted their claims in varying forms and recorded, as they thought, their success in varying degrees.

20. The contemporary Kannaḍa work *Saundara-Kāvya* (*c.* 1740) of Nūronda (V, 6) refers to the Mughal army of the Nawāb as having been made up of one *akshauhiṇi*, which, of course, has to be taken to mean a large and well-equipped force. For an account of this work, *vide* under *Literary activity* in Ch. XIII. See also and compare *Wilks*, I. 258.

21. *Saund. Kāv.*, V, 13, VIII, 96. According to this work (V, 9-15), even Dōst Alī is said to have taken part in the expedition, along with Sikandar Khān, Ambar Khān, Ibrāhim Khān, Abdul Nabi Bahadūr Khān, Chānd Khān, Dilāvar Khān, and others. See also *Wilks*, I.c.

reducing Baiche-Gauḍa of Chikballāpur, and finally, marching past Hoskōṭe and Bangalore, encamped on the extensive field of Kailancha (*Kailanchada viśāla-bīḍu*), not far from Channapaṭṇa.[22] At this news, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya set about making grand preparations for the defence of Seringapatam, ordering a general mobilisation of the forces from the 84 administrative units (*gaḍi*).[23] Meanwhile an agent (*niyōgi*) from the Nawāb's camp, we learn,[24] advised the authorities in Seringapatam to make peace with the invader and save the situation, but he received a stern reply to the contrary and was obliged to retire from the capital city.

Action at Kailancha, January 1737.

Early in January 1737, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya, with Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya as second in command, marched on at the head of a well-equipped army, to oppose the enemy.[25] Passing through the plain of Maṇḍya, he halted on the banks of the Shimśā at Maddūr, from where he arranged through experienced scouts (*ballida kaḷḷa-baṇṭaru*) to study the situation. On receipt of their report, he resumed his march and advanced in the direction of Channapaṭṇa. Splitting up the vanguard of his army (*chūṇi bala*) into convenient divisions, he next proceeded towards Kailancha, and from a vantage ground directed Nanjarājaiya to keep watch and ward in the camp. It was night. The sound of war-drums and trumpets accompanied by the flash of torches (*dīvaṭige*,

22. *Ibid*, V, 16-29. Kailancha is an extant village, head-quarters of a *hōbḷi* of that name in Closepet taluk, Bangalore district (see *List of Villages*, 22).

23. *Ibid*, 30-50. 24. *Ibid*, VI, 28-36.

25. *Vide*, on this section, *Ibid*, VI, 38-78, VII-X. The introductory portion of a Ms. of the Telugu work *Śivabhaktavilāsam* (*c.* 1740) of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya, also refers to Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya's signal victory over Khāsīm Khān, Murād Khān and other generals (*Sēnādhīśvara Dēva bhūvibhuḍu Kāsim Khāna mādyaṇ Murāt khānādyudbhaṭa yāvanādhipula saṅgrāmambu saṅgūlchi . . .*). For further reference to the work, *vide* under *Literary activity* in Ch. XIII. See also and compare *Wilks* (I. 258-259) who too places the event in 1737.

panju) from the camp of the Mysore army, attracted the attention of the enemy who sent in a party to reconnoitre the position. Next morning, on their return, a portion of the Nawāb's army, on the pretext of securing fodder (*kabāḍada nevadoḷu*), began to move in the opposite direction, to the utter surprise and excitement of their opponents. But the Mughals, in the height of their conceit, soon went off their guard (*yachchara maradu mūgarvadi barutire*). The vigilant Mysore troops turned forthwith upon them, effecting casualties in their ranks. And this became the signal for war. Roused to a pitch of fury, the main army of the Nawāb rushed on to the scene and began hostilities. Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya was equal to the occasion. He put up a stout opposition, leading the entire forces under his own command. So adroitly did he conduct the manœuvre that the Mughals, fighting in a disorderly mode from the backs of elephants and horses, soon proved a poor match for the well-organized body of trained swordsmen of Mysore. The result was that on the very first day Dēvarājaiya was able to strike panic into the advancing troops and cause considerable slaughter among them, capturing an elephant. Nevertheless, the Nawāb's generals continued to hold the field. Next day, they despatched an agent to Dēvarājaiya warning him of the consequences of a severe action. Dēvarājaiya, however, scoffing at this ruse of the enemy to force a peace on him, ordered the advance of the Mysore army under his brother Nanjarājaiya. The latter, seated on an elephant and surrounded by a select retinue of the junior members of the Kaḷale Family (*Kaḷile paṭṭada dhore dhoregaḷa makkaḷu*), directed the operations of the day, himself fighting bow and arrow in hand. The Mughals also resumed their position and fought desperately, presenting a united front. However, the superior tactics of the swordsmen on

Mughal reverses.

the Mysore side told heavily upon them. Nanjarājaiya himself had a tough hand-to-hand fight with Bāramalla, whom he slew on the field; Murād Khān, Khāsīm Khān, Sikandar Khān and Bahadūr Khān were among other generals who fell dead on the field; the remnant of the Arcot army was put to rout amidst great loss, and the Mysoreans made prize of several horses and elephants in their camp. With the spoils of war thus obtained, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya, accompanied by Nanjarājaiya, returned to Seringapatam, where, in honour of the victory, a grand *Durbār* was held shortly after.

Internal affairs, 1734-1739.

All through the period 1734-1739, the internal affairs of Mysore were being managed in their own interests by Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya and his colleagues, who took full advantage of the minority of Krishṇarāja and the weakness and credulity of the dowager queen Dēvājamma.[26] Jobbery and nepotism assumed an ascendency in their administration, which was extraordinary even for those times. Civil and military posts (like those of Amildār, Śirastēdār and Killēdār), during these years, were disposed of by Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya in favour of the nominees proposed by Dēvarājaiya and Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya on the sole recommendations of the corrupt officials in their personal employ. Further, the trio used to appropriate for their private use at two to three thousand *varahas* out of the public revenues of each administrative unit (*gaḍi*), besides claiming a special share (*paṇya*) out of the produce of demesne or Palace lands. Their example was followed by their own servants who, in turn, appropriated at 100 to 200 *varahas* from the receipts of each division. Pradhān Venkaṭapataiya had his own share of the revenues, ranging from 500 to 1,000 *varahas* per unit.[27] As head of the

26. *Annals*, I. 174-175.

27. *Ibid*; see also and compare *Wilks*, I. 256-257. There is not even a whisper of this aspect of administration of the Daḷavāis in the *Mys.*

departments of revenue and finance, Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya profited most by this system of organised peculation and fraud. Having, however, already passed the prime of his life and having no issue, he, as a pious Hindu, was, in his last days, we are told,[28] overcome by qualms of conscience, and desired to dispose of his temporal effects for his eternal benefit. Accordingly, when he knew that his end was drawing near, it is stated,[29] he arranged to place before the young king, his nominal master, two lakhs of *varahas* and set apart another half a lakh for his own obsequies and for the maintenance of his wife Chandāyamma. At the same time, he also, it is added,[30] represented to both the king and the dowager, that no credence need be placed in the Mahrattas, that Venkaṭapataiya of Kannambāḍi was to be appointed *Karaṇika* of the *Ubhaya-chāvaḍi* and not confirmed in the office of *Pradhān*, that hostilities with the Mughals (*i.e.*, the Nawāb of Arcot) were to cease, and that, of the two brothers Muhammad Śābās Sāhib and Haidar Alī Khān—then serving under Katti Gōpālarāja Urs at Bangalore[31]—the younger, Haidar Alī, was to be appointed to the charge of 50 horse and 100 foot, cautioning that he (Haidar) was not to be entrusted with more power, as it might eventually betoken trouble to the State. In 1739 (*Siddhārthi*), Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya died in Seringapaṭam, and was succeeded by Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya at the instance of Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya.[32] The two brothers became henceforward the virtual dictators of the kingdom of Mysore, actively representing

---

Rāj. Cha. (40), which, on the contrary, merely eulogises Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya as a servant devoted to the cause of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar (*Daḷapati mahārājaśrī Dēvarājaiyanavaru Krishṇarāja Woḍeyaraiyanavara kāryakke atyuttamarāgi*). For a critical notice of this work, *vide* Ch. III, f.n. 61.

28. *Ibid*, 175; see also and compare *Wilks*, I. 256.
29. *Ibid.* 30. *Ibid*, 175-176.
31. For particulars about the early career and rise of Haidar, *vide* Ch. X.
32. *Annals*, I., 176.

Krishṇarāja, and taking part in the foreign politics of the times.[33]

Second Phase: 1739-1746.

The fortunes of Mysore from 1739 onwards become so inextricably bound up with the general course of affairs in the Karnāṭak and Southern India, that it is necessary to start with a retrospect of the latter.[34]

Retrospect of affairs:

The Mughals and the Mahrattas in South India, 1737-1740.

Alī Dōst Khān, Nawāb of Arcot, never recovered from the shock of the disastrous defeat he sustained at Kailancha in 1737. Since 1736, Chandā Sāhib, his son-in-law, was becoming almost independent in the South as master of the *subāh* of Trichinopoly.[35] In 1738, taking advantage of the internal troubles which prevailed in Tanjore since the death of Tukōji (1728-1735), he, accompanied by his brother-in-law Safdar Alī, invaded that kingdom, shutting up its then ruler Saiyāji powerless in his capital.[36] Already in April 1739, the Mahrattas, profiting by the absence of Nizām-ul-mulk (Asaf Jāh) from the Deccan, were expected to carry on their incursions into the Karnāṭak, including the "Misore [Mysore] country."[37] Early in 1740, a Mahratta army, consisting

33. The mention of "King of Misore [Mysore]" in the diplomatic literature for the period 1740-1755 (cited in this Ch. and in Chs. VI-VIII) is to be understood to refer to the reigning king Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar II, as represented by the Daḷavāi brothers Dēvarājaiya and Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya.

34. *Vide*, for general reference on this phase, *Wilks*, I. 273-282; *Haid. Nām.*, ff. 3; *Tuzak.*, pp. 70-72, 82-83; *C.H.I.*, V. 118-119; T. Wheeler, *History of Madras*, pp. 551-556, 571-581, 599-603; *Tanjore Dist. Gaz.*, I. 44-49, etc. For specific references, see *infra*.

35. *Tuzak.*, p. 72. The real name of Chandā Sāhib, according to this work (pp. 69-74), was, as mentioned above (see p. 73), Husain Dōst Khān, the former being a surname of his denoting that he was a person of attractive features (*Chandā*-from Skt. Chandra, Moon, to please, gladden; Persian, *Chānd*, from Skt. *Chandra*; cf. *Chānd-Bībi*, moon-like lady). An alternative derivation suggested is from *Alexander*, of which the popular form is *Sikandar*, of which *Chand* is said to be a shortened form. Cf. Mal. *Chāndy*, and Scot. *Sandy*, which are well-known abbreviations of the name *Alexander*.

36. *Di. A. Pi.*, I. 64.

37. *Letters to Fort St. George* (1739), p. 31: *Letter* No. 34 dated April 4, 1739.

of more than 40,000 horse under the command of Futte Singh and Raghuji-Bhōnsle,[38] proceeded on an expedition to Arcot to collect the *chauth*.[39] In May, the aged Nawāb, hard pressed by the enemy and disappointed by the tardy movements of his son Safdar Alī—then with the main army at Trichinopoly—defended himself gallantly at the head of 3,000 horse and foot, and was killed at the pass of Dāmalcheruvu.[40] The town of Arcot was plundered by the Mahrattas and the country became a prey to anarchy and confusion. Meantime news was afloat that Nāsir Jang, second son of the Nizām, was marching southward at the head of 125,000 horse, detaching 10,000 under the command of Nawāb Amīn Khān with instructions "to seize the passes leading to the kingdom of Misore [Mysore]," "to prevent the Mahrattas' escape."[41]

The Mahratta conquest of Trichinopoly, 1740-1741.

In June 1740, Safdar Alī, who succeeded his father as the Nawāb of Arcot (1740-1742), appeared on the scene and concluded peace with the Mahrattas, consenting to pay the *chauth*.[42] The Mahrattas, however, agreed to leave the province on condition of being paid a sum of money.[43]

38. *Sel. Pub. Cons.* (1740), p. 51: *Letter* No. 67 dated July 9, 1740; cf. *Tuzak.*, p. 72.

39. *Tuzak.*, l.c.; cf. *Haid. Nām.*, ff. 3; *Count. Corres.* (1740), p. 12 (cited in *C. H. I.*, V. 118, f.n. 2).

40. *Ibid*, pp. 72-73; also *Haid. Nām.*, l.c.; Wheeler, *o.c.*, pp. 555-556 (quoting letter dated May 12, 1740). Dāmalcheruvu (the "Damalcherue," "Damalcherri" of Persian and English sources) is a village in Chandragiri taluk, Chittoor district, Madras, 19 miles north of Chittoor. So called after a large tank—more correctly Tāmara-Cheruvu, the Lotus Tank. By this Pass, which is at the entrance of the valley leading to Kallūrghāṭ, Śivāji made his first descent upon the Karnāṭak (1677). During Haidar's invasion of the Karnāṭak in 1780-81, it formed the main route for supplies for his troops.

41. *Cal. Mad. Rec.* (1740-1744), p. 49: *Letter* No. 169, received June 13, 1740; also *Count. Corres.* (1740), p. 19: *Letter* No. 43 dated June 13, 1740.

42. *Tuzak.*, p. 73.

43. *Letters from Fort St. George* (1740), pp. 30-31: *Letter* No. 52 dated June 13, 1740; also *Sel. Pub. Cons.* (1740), p. 50: *Letter* No. 52 of the same date.

Safdar Alī paid them in part but was under great difficulty as to how to raise the rest.[44] However, shutting himself up in Vellore, he made them quit his territory a short distance from Arcot;[45] and attempted to make good the stipulated amount from the taluks of the Karnāṭak-Pāyanghāṭ.[46] Further, he demanded from Chandā Sāhib the portion of the *chauth* assigned for Trichinopoly, but Chandā refused to comply.[47] Aggrieved at this, Safdar Alī, early in July, secretly turned against him the Mahrattas, then on their way to Bālaghāṭ.[48] The Mahrattas, by now reinforced by a contingent of 20,000 horse under Siddōji-Ghōrpaḍe, passed through the kingdom of Mysore, raising contributions.[49] And finally, about the middle of October, they encamped at Trichinopoly.[50] Before commencing hostilities, they appear to have attempted to square up matters with Chandā Sāhib who, in the first instance, we are told,[51] sought to bargain with them for rupees seven lakhs. However, as we shall see in the sequel,[52] the conflicting claims and interests of local powers which were at work, stood in the way of their settlement with him. Accordingly, about the end of December 1740, the Mahrattas laid siege to Trichinopoly. Chandā was obliged to seek the help of his brother Baḍē Sāhib. Early in 1741, the latter marched on with the troops of Diṇḍigal, Madura, Tinnevelly and other parts, to Chandā's succour; he was, however, intercepted by the Mahrattas and was, in the confusion which followed during a pitched battle near Koḍuttaḷam, slain with his younger brother Sādak

44. *Ibid.* 45. *Ibid*; also *Tuzuk.*, l.c. 46. *Tuzak.*, l.c.
47. *Ibid*; cf. *Haid. Nām.*, l.c.; Wheeler, *o.c.*, p. 578. 48. *Ibid.*
49. *Letters from Fort St. George* (1740), pp. 41-42: l.c.; also *Sel. Pub. Cons.* (1740), p. 51: l.c.; and *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, p. 59: *Letter* No. 209 dated July 9, 1740.
50. *Ibid*, p. 69: *Letter* No. 110 dated October 20, 1740.
51. *Count. Corres.* (1740), p. 47: *Letter* No. 116 dated December 5, 1740; cf. Wheeler, *o.c.*, pp. 578-579; also *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, p. 117: *Letter* No. 443, received December 15, 1740.
52. *Vide* under *The Hindu Cause in Southern India*, below.

Sāhib and several of his men.[53] On March 25, 1741, the Mahrattas, after a siege of three months, succeeded in escalading the walls of the Trichinopoly fort and taking possession of it.[54] In vain did Chandā Sāhib treat for terms agreeing to pay "a sum of twelve lakhs of rupees to the Mahrattas, on condition that he should be allowed to return [to the fort] in safety."[55] But he was, with his eldest son Abīd Sāhib and two others, taken prisoner by Raghuji, and was, shortly after, conveyed through Mysore to Satāra, along with 40,000 Mahratta horse.[56] Murāri Rao-Ghōrpaḍe of Gooty, nephew of Śāntaji-Ghōrpaḍe, was for the time being placed with 4,000 horse in charge of Trichinopoly fort as its Governor, and the rest of the Mahratta army marched home through Gingee and Mysore during April-May.[57]

Deccan and Karnāṭak politics, 1741-1744.

Meanwhile, in Poona, Pēshwa Bāji Rao I had died, being succeeded by his son Bālāji Bāji Rao (1740); and Nizām-ul-mulk had returned to the Deccan in time to crush a rebellion raised by his son Nāsir Jang (1741). In October 1742, Nawāb Safdar Alī was put to death by poison by Ghulām Murtazā Alī Khān, another brother-in-law of his. In the confusion and turmoil which followed in Arcot, Ghulām Murtazā ruled for six months, when he was succeeded nominally by Saiyid Muhammad (Sādatullā Khān II), the ten-year old son of Safdar Alī, as Nawāb.[58] In January 1743, Nizām-ul-mulk, taking advantage of this state of affairs, marched on to the south with Nāsir Jang, leaving his deputy, Nawāb

53. *Tuzak.*, pp. 73-74; *Haid. Nām.*, l.c.; cf. Wheeler, *o.c.*, pp. 579-580.
54. *Di. A. Pi.*, I. 161; cf. *Haid. Nām.*, l.c.; Wheeler, *o.c.*, p. 580.
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, p. 159: *Letter* No. 126 dated April 8, 1741; also *Sel. Pub. Cons.* (1741), p. 59: *Letter* of the same date.
57. *Ibid*, also p. 162: *Letter* No. 136 dated April 16, 1741; *Desp. Eng.* (1741-1742), p. 14: *Despatch* of the same date; *Sel. Pub. Cons.* (1741), pp. 59 and 62: l.c.; also *Haid. Nām.*, l.c.
58. *Tuzak.*, pp. 80 and 111; cf. *Haid. Nām.*, l.c.

Sirājud-daula Anwar-ud-dīn, in charge of the *subāh* of Hyderabad.[59] After securing the submission of petty chiefs, he entered the town of Arcot unopposed (February), and appointed his general Khwāja Abdullā Khān to the charge of that *subāh*.[60] Proceeding further, he encamped with his whole army (consisting, it is said,[61] of 70,000 horse and foot) before the fort of Trichinopoly and laid siege to it for six months.[62] In the meantime, Bābū (Bāpūji) Nāyak, a Mahratta *sardār*, acting under the advice of the Pēshwa, had advanced on the Deccan at the head of a lakh of horse to collect the *chauth*, and been routed with heavy loss by Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn (*c.* February-March).[63] About July-August, however, the Pēshwa himself in great wrath ordered the collection and despatch of an army of three lakhs of foot to the Deccan.[64] At this news, Nizām-ul-mulk, finding the fort of Trichinopoly impregnable, made peace with Murāri Rao.[65] On the latter's evacuation of the place in August, the Nizām retraced his steps, accompanied by Khwāja Abdullā who left behind him at Arcot a deputy, Khwāja Nīmatullā Khān, a relation of his.[66] The Nizām was, however, on his way home, encircled by the Mahrattas, and was only rescued by the timely arrival of Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn who forced the Pēshwa to conclude peace with his master (Nizām) and retire dropping his claim to

Renewed Mughal-Mahratta struggles.

59. *Ibid*, pp. 42-43. According to this work (pp. 38-42), Anwar-ud-dīn was in charge of the Nizāmat of Chicācole, Rājbandar and Masulipatam under Asaf Jāh before his appointment by the latter to the *subāh* of Hyderabad.
60. *Ibid*, p. 82. 61. *Di. A. Pi.*, l. 214. 62. *Tuzak.*, l.c.
63. *Ibid*, pp. 45-47. Bāpū Nāyak figures in later history. He was a Brāhman military officer of the time. There is a street named after him in Kumbakōṇam town, where he seems to have established himself.
64. *Ibid*, pp. 47-48. 65. *Ibid*, pp. 48 and 83.
66. *Ibid*, pp. 48, 83-84. There is an air of suspicion centring round Murāri Rao's evacuation of Trichinopoly. Probably he was won over by the Nizām, which, as we shall see, perhaps accounts for why the Ghōrpaḍes later made common cause with the Mughals against the Mahrattas under Bābū Nāyak in the struggle for supremacy in the South.

the *chauth* (*c.* January-March 1744).[67] In March 1744, Khwāja Abdullā Khān, the Nawāb designate, was, on the very day of his journey to Arcot, found dead in his *chauki* (a raised seat).[68] In his place the Nizām appointed Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn and the latter reached Arcot in April 1744. With the accession of Anwar, followed by the assassination of Saiyid Muhammad, the rule of the Nawāyat family of the Nawābs of Arcot practically came to an end, and that of a new dynasty owning direct allegiance to the Nizām began.[69]

The Hindu cause in Southern India (from 1736).

Alongside of these developments, the restoration of Hindu rule in Trichinopoly had become a live issue in Southern India ever since the capture of the place by Chandā Sāhib and the extinction of the Nāyaka règime in Madura (1736). Of this movement, Bangāru-Tirumala, father of Vijaya-Kumāra (the adopted heir-elect of Mīnākshi, last of the Nāyaka rulers of Madura), was evidently the prime figure. He was assisted by Saiyāji, the Rājah of Tanjore (1738-1740).[70] Saiyāji, deeply resenting the injuries he had sustained from Chandā Sāhib in 1738,[71] seems to have allied himself with Bangāru about June 1740, and sought the aid of his kinsmen, the Mahrattas—then near Arcot—to put an end to the Muhammadan domination in Trichinopoly. The Mahrattas were, however, as we have seen, turned on Trichinopoly by Nawāb Safdar Alī, primarily for the realization of part of their *chauth*. And they found the situation in Trichinopoly complicated by the conflicting interests of local powers on the one side and Chandā Sāhib on the other. At the same time, the cause of Bangāru-Tirumala suffered by the deposition of Saiyāji and

67. *Ibid*, pp. 48-51. 68. *Ibid*, p. 51; also *Haid. Nām.*, l.c.
69. *Ibid*, pp. 51-57, 110-111. The earlier Nawābs of Arcot, according to this source (p. 82), had direct relationship with the court of Delhi and had no connection with the Nāzims of the Deccan (*i.e.*, the Nizām).
70. *Tanjore Dist. Gaz.*, I. 46. 71. *Ibid.*

the succession of his brother Pratāp Singh (1740-1763) to the *masnad* of Tanjore. Bangāru, therefore, appears to have turned for help to the Maravas and the Toṇḍamān chief. A letter, received in Madras on December 15, 1740,[72] speaks of these latter as collecting "5,000 horse and 40,000 foot" and designing "to make the son of Caut Rajah (of Trichinopoly family) King." Indeed, it was with the assistance of these confederates, among others, that Raghuji-Bhōnsle, the Mahratta leader, was, we learn,[73] able to carry the siege of Trichinopoly to success in March 1741.

The Mahratta conquest of Trichinopoly (1741) and after.

The Mahratta conquest of Trichinopoly which thus took place, proved, however, to be more a temporary occupation than a permanent acquisition. For, no sooner was Chandā Sāhib captured and sent away to Satāra than the Mahrattas were faced with the task of reviving Hindu rule, and reconciling conflicting interests, in Trichinopoly on the one hand and, on the other, of fulfilling their obligations to Nawāb Safdar Alī after the collection of their *chauth*. According to a letter dated April 8, 1741,[74] "Raghoji Bhonsle is negotiating with Ramanayya and Govindayya [agents, probably, of Bangāru-Tirumala], with a view to restore the old Hindu family." According to another, dated April 16,[75] "Trichinopoly will either be restored to the old Rajah's family or be placed under a Maratha." According to a third, of the same date,[76] "It was for a time uncertain what the Morattas [Mahrattas] would do with Tritchanopoly [Trichinopoly]. There were several bidders for it." The Mahrattas, however, we further learn,[77] "were

72. *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, p. 177: *Letter* No. 448. The son of Caut Rajah, referred to in this document, seems obviously to be Vijaya-Kumāra, son of Bangāru-Tirumala, in the light of the context.
73. *Di. A. Pi.*, I. 161. 74. *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, p. 159: *Letter* No. 126.
75. *Ibid*, p. 162: *Letter* No. 136.
76. *Desp. Eng.* (1741-1742), p. 14, para 63.
77. *Ibid.*

most inclined to put in the next heir of the late Queen [Mīnākshi]" but "he could not give them security for the money he offered." It was on such considerations as these that they found it expedient to appoint Murāri Rao temporarily as Viceroy at Trichinopoly, "till the Sou Rajah [Shāhu Rājah] should give further orders"; "would not suffer the place to be plundered, when they took possession of it"; and, at the time of their returning home, "left orders with the Viceroy [Murāri Rao], to pay the same tribute to Arcot which had been actually paid by the Kings and Queens of Tritchanopoly."[78] Although the cause of the Nāyaka family of Madura suffered considerably under these circumstances, the position of Murāri Rao at Trichinopoly since April 1741 was by no means safe. Indeed little is known as to how he discharged the obligations to Safdar Alī, imposed on him by the Mahratta leaders. But there are indications that Safdar Alī, as the Nawāb of Arcot, apprehended trouble to himself from a possible combination of Chandā Sāhib, the Nizām and the Mahrattas against him, especially as he had not been confirmed in his Nawābship by "patent" from the "court" of the Imperial Mughal.[79] This was enough to induce him in May 1741 to engage himself "in some treaty with the King of Misore [Mysore] to dispossess the Morattas of Tritchanopoly."[80] Thereupon Murāri Rao wrote[81] to Robert Benyon, Governor and President of the Council at *Fort St. George*, Madras (1735-1744), "desiring to be supplied with ammunition and warlike stores." His request hardly met with any response, as the English at this time, in the language of the *Fort St. George Despatch* of the day,[82] understood "so little of the language

78. *Ibid.*
79. *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, p. 203: *Letter* No. 283 dated September 26, 1741; also *Desp. Eng.* (1741-1742), p. 39, para 18: *Consultation* dated January 18, 1742.
80. *Desp. Eng.*, p. 15, para 68: *Despatch* dated April 16, 1741; also *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, l.c.
81. *Ibid.* 82. *Ibid.*

of this country" and had "such bad interpreters" about them, that they were "very little capable of forming any judgment of the politicks and interests of the several princes, for which reason it is a maxim with us to have as little to do with any of them as possible." The menace of Safdar Alī's projected invasion of Trichinopoly received, however, a death-blow from the troubled state of affairs at Arcot (since 1740),[83] which led to his own death in October 1742.

The situation affected adversely the Hindu cause in Southern India. The death of Safdar Alī and the confusion which followed in its train in Arcot, left the Karnāṭak and South India open to the ambitions of the Nizām. Trichinopoly became, as it were, a bone of contention between the Mahrattas and the Nizām. After its evacuation by Murāri Rao in August 1743, it passed into the *subāh* of the Deccan under the control of the Nizām and within the immediate jurisdiction of the Nawāb of Arcot.[84] The cause of Bangāru-Tirumala became a forlorn one. During the Nizām's siege of Trichinopoly (February-August 1743), he paid him a visit in the vain hope of obtaining his favour and assistance. Subsequently, Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn was directed by his master, the Nizām, to take kindly care of Bangāru. According to the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle*, he is said to have been poisoned by Anwar-ud-dīn while residing in Arcot as his pensioner. His (Bangāru's) son returned to Śivaganga and we hear little of him for some time.[85] Trichinopoly during Anwar-ud-dīn's Nawābship of Arcot (1744-1749) was placed at first under his second son Muhammad Mahfūz Khān and later under his third son Muhammad Alī (Hadrat-i-Alā) —afterwards Nawāb Muhammad Alī Wālājāh—the city itself being named by the latter as *Natharnagar*

83. *Tuzak.*, pp. 75-80.
84. *Ibid*, p. 127.
85. *Ibid*, pp. 70-71, f.n. 1.

after a Muslim saint, a Sayyid by name Hadrat Nathar Walī.[86]

Trichinopoly, the southern objective of Mysore, *c.* 1735-1745.

Mysore had her own interests in the struggle centring round the restoration of Hindu rule in Madura and Trichinopoly. As we have seen in the earlier chapters,[87] Trichinopoly became the objective of her southern expansion as early as 1642, and this, side by side with the gradually growing claim of her rulers to the sovereignty of the Karnāṭaka country, formed the pivotal point of her political development throughout the greater part of the latter half of the seventeenth century—a position which was keenly contested from time to time

86. *Ibid*, pp. 109, 127-135. *Trichinopoly*: About 210 miles from Mysore *via* Karūr and Hāsanūr. The fight for Trichinopoly which looms so large in the history of this period and later enters into the epoch of Anglo-French alliances and warfare in the south of India, marks the transition from the period of Hindu rule to that of the British in it. By its situation, its antiquity, its sacred character, its fame as the capital of the Madura Nāyakas, and its size and population, it has ever been considered a place of great importance. When the Hoysaḷas of Mysore first penetrated into the South (13th-14th cent.), they fixed it as their southern capital. The Chōḷas made it one of their first capitals before they moved on to Tanjore. The Nāyakas transferred their capital to it from Madura in 1660. Possession of Trichinopoly which was prized by the contending parties of the period (*i.e.*, the Mysoreans, Mahrattas and the Mughal representatives), came to be considered as possessing the key to the Karnāṭak denoting the whole of Southern India in the old Vijayanagar imperial sense of the term. The fight for it was accordingly a fight for the supremacy of the South. If this central fact is remembered, we understand why the fight for supremacy was concentrated on its possession. The city takes its name from the holy rock (*Tiru-śila*) which dominates it for miles around. Previous to the demolition of the ramparts in 1845, the rock formed the citadel of a large fort one mile long by half a mile wide. Now, only the fortifications of the rock remain. The rock is of syenite, 600 feet above the alluvial plain from which it rises, and is a very striking object viewed from a distance. The ascent to it is partly by steps cut in the rock itself. Upon it is a temple dedicated to Śiva, whence the phrase *Tiru-śila*, "Holy Rock." Near the Teppakuḷam is pointed the house occupied by Robert Clive. Chandā Sāhib who was put to death in 1752 by Mānāji (Mānakji), the commander of the Tanjore forces, in alliance with the English, lies buried at the shrine of Nathar, which perhaps belongs to the time of the invasion of Mālik Kāfūr (1310). It was evidently built out of the materials gathered from older Hindu structures which probably occupied its site.

87. *Ante*, Vol. I, Chs. VIII, X and XI.

by the competing claimants of the period (such, for instance, as the Nāyaks of Madura and Ikkēri, the Deccan states of Bijāpur and Gōlkoṇḍa, and the Mahrattas), and attended with varying degrees of success for Mysore. During the general convulsions of the period 1704-1734, however, this southern objective of hers receded for a time to the background, but, as indicated in an earlier connection,[88] began to assert itself during 1735-1736 when the Mysore army was engaged in incursions into Malabar and Madura. Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya's signal victory over Nawāb Alī Dōst Khān (of Arcot) at Kailancha in 1737, while it tended to check the latter's pretensions to authority over Mysore, left the field open for Mysorean ambition in the south. But, in the meantime, Chandā Sāhib had taken possession of Trichinopoly and brought Nāyaka rule in Madura to an end (1736). Before, however, Ḍēvarājaiya could take effective steps against Chandā, he was evidently disturbed by the activities of the Mahrattas in Arcot, their exaction of contributions from Mysore and their encampment before Trichinopoly (June-December 1740). The destruction of Chandā Sāhib with the help of the Mahrattas, ostensibly for the restoration of Nāyaka rule in Trichinopoly but really for the eventual absorption of that place in the kingdom of Mysore as a strategic point in the south, had become the ulterior motive of Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya in regard to the affairs of Trichinopoly, about December 1740. Indeed, according to a letter dated December 5, 1740,[89] "the King of Misore [Mysore] offered the Morattas [Mahrattas] fifty lakhs of rupees, if they will kill Chanda Sahib or take him prisoner and resettle the gentue [Hindu] government in the kingdom of Trichinopoly." The Mahrattas, however, as we have seen, carried on the siege of Trichinopoly (1740-1741)

88. *Vide* f.n. 13 and 17 *supra*.

89. *Count. Corres.* (1740), p. 47: *Letter* No. 116; also *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, p. 117: *Letter* No. 443, cited in f.n. 72 *supra*.

more inclined to the cause of the Nāyaka family of Madura and its adherents (the Maravas and the Toṇḍamān chief) than acceding to the overtures of either Chandā Sāhib or Mysore. The Mahratta conquest of Trichinopoly (1741) appeared as if, for the time being, to frustrate the southern objective of Mysore. Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya, however, steadily kept his watchful eye on the place, which, perhaps, accounts also for why, in May 1741, Nawāb Safdar Alī (of Arcot) was, as above referred to,[90] induced to seek the help of Mysore against the Mahrattas. The death of Safdar Alī in October 1742 seemed to affect the interests of Mysore in Trichinopoly and those of the Nāyaka family there. In January 1743, therefore, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya found it expedient to reiterate his claim on Trichinopoly and attempted to take it with the assistance of Nizām-ul-mulk, then in Cuddapah, with a lakh of foot, on his way to Arcot.[91] Accordingly, about this time, it became the latter's design "to put the Raja of Misore [Mysore] in possession of Trichinopoly on [the Rājah] paying a crore of rupees."[92] Dēvarājaiya—who, as we know, represented the king of Mysore during this period—was, however, obviously not in a position to pay this heavy price or even half of it,[93] the finances of the kingdom having already suffered considerably from the contributions levied by the Mahrattas in 1740. The interests of

90. *Vide* text of f.n. 80 *supra*.

91. *Desp. Eng.* (1743-1746), p. 3, item No. 56; also *Cal. Mad. Rec.*, p. 359: *Letter* No. 24 dated January 27, 1743.

92. *Ibid.*

93. This transaction is, perhaps, best, though incidentally, alluded to by Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya in *Count. Corres.* (1753), p. 28: *Letter* No. 48 dated March 12, 1753—Daḷavāi to Saunders. According to him, the Nizām (in 1743) had "agreed to give the fort" of Trichinopoly to Mysore "for 50 lakhs of Rupees" and sent a message to the latter through Vinnāji-Pant ("Vinnazey Punt"), but the authorities in Seringapatam "did not then care to accept it." Vinnāji-Pant (or Vinnāji-Paṇḍit) figures in later history as well. He belonged to a village called Patchūr, near Jālārpet, the M. & S. M. Ry. junction.

Mysore, and no less the cause of the Nāyaka family of Madura, were again affected when Trichinopoly—after its siege by the Nizām and its evacuation by Murāri Rao (1743)—was, as we have noted, included within the immediate jurisdiction of Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn of Arcot in 1744.

Nevertheless, Trichinopoly, as the southernmost limit of expansion of the kingdom of Mysore, tended in an increasing measure to engage the attention of Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya and his brother Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya, especially after the final disappearance of Bangāru-Tirumala (of the Nāyaka family of Madura) from the arena of South Indian politics (*c.* 1744). Meanwhile, the Mahrattas, after their Deccan reverses (1743-1744), had been active in the south, being evidently alarmed by Murāri Rao's evacuation of Trichinopoly (August 1743). Towards the close of 1744, Pēshwa Bālāji Bāji Rao despatched again to the Deccan a Mahratta army of two lakhs of horse, commanded for the second time by Bābū Nāyak.[94] The recovery of Trichinopoly became the definite objective of the Mahrattas and the frustration of it the key-note of Nizām-ul-mulk's policy. Accordingly, the Nizām desired Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn (of Arcot) to put up a stout opposition to the Mahrattas with the help of all the Karnāṭak chiefs and allies.[95] In December 1744, Anwar-ud-dīn marched against Bābū Nāyak at the head of 65,000 horse, being joined also by his third son Muhammad Alī from Hyderabad.[96] Before commencing hostilities, however, Anwar-ud-dīn attempted to pacify the Mahrattas by offering them "a sum of money" but they were found "to demand Trichinopoly."[97] Thereupon, in January 1745, Anwar-ud-dīn engaged Bābū Nāyak in a week's action at Basavāpaṭṇa (*Baswapatan*)

94. *Tuzak.*, pp. 111-112. 95. *Ibid*, p. 112.
96. *Ibid*, pp. 112-113; *Mad. Desp.* (1744-1755), p. 9: *Despatch* dated February 15, 1745. See also f.n. 100 *infra*.
97. *Mad. Desp.*, l.c.

and put him to rout amidst great loss.[98] "The Nawwāb," in the words of the contemporary chronicler Burhan,[99] "followed him [Bābū Nāyak] up to Trichinopoly. There again for the second time the pursued one opposed him. The Nawwāb exhibited great bravery in fighting and pursuing the enemy. The enemy offered battle for the third time at the *maydān* of Baswapatan and tried to fight with all his strength. After three days and three nights he was routed with his friends and defeated with his companions. In short, according to his wont, he ran away." About March-April 1745, the Nawāb returned triumphantly to Arcot.

In this struggle with Bābū Nāyak, Mysore, along with the chiefs of Cuddapah, Kurnool, Savaṇūr, Sīra and Ikkēri, and with Muzaffar Jang (Hidāyat Muhiyud-dīn-Khān)—grandson of Nizām-ul-mulk—then *jahgīrdār* of Adoni, made common cause with Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn by furnishing a quota of nine thousand horse.[100] Evidently it was as much in the interests of Mysore as in those of the Nizām and the Nawāb that Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya found it expedient to safeguard Trichinopoly against the Mahrattas.

Mysore and Malabar, 1745-1746.

During the latter part of the year 1745, after the return of the Mysore troops from the action (against the Mahrattas) at Basavāpaṭṇa, the situation in Malabar seemed to engross the attention of Dēvarājaiya. By 1737

98. *Tuzak.*, pp. 113-114; see also the *Ke. N. V.* (XI, vv. 89-40), which places the event in *Raktākshi*, *Pushya* (January 1745). Basavāpaṭṇa is the head-quarters of an extant *hōbḷi* of that name in Channagiri taluk, Shimoga district (see *List of Villages*, 138).

99. *Ibid.*

100. *Ibid*, pp. 112-113. The numerical strength of the forces assembled on the occasion amounted, according to this source, to 65,000 horse, 45,000 being the number raised by the local powers (*viz.*, Cuddapah, 3,000; Kurnool, 2,000; Savaṇūr, 1,500; Sīra, 1,500; Bednūr or Ikkēri, 6,000; Mysore, 9,000; Adoni, 22,000), and 20,000 by Anwar-ud-din and Muhammad Ali at 12,000 and 8,000 respectively. Apparently by a slip, the total is set down as 69,000 on p. 113 of the text.

the siege of Cannanore—referred to in the preceding chapter—had been raised, and the English factors at Tellicherry mediated a peace between the rulers of Cotata and Ikkēri, by which they obtained the exclusive privilege of purchasing the valuable commodities of Malabar, namely, pepper, cardamoms and sandalwood.[101] Since then, the English found themselves faced with the rivalry of the French at Māhe and the Dutch at Cannanore on the one side and, on the other, with the persistent opposition and hostility of the Moors (Moplahs) of Cannanore (then in alliance with the Dutch), with whom they came into a rupture during August-September 1745. The local powers in Malabar, such as the chiefs of Koḷattiri and Pālghāṭ and the Zāmorin of Calicut, were hostile and divided among themselves, viewing with alternate friendliness and suspicion the activities of the European powers.[102]

There are indications, and it is significant, that, between October 1745 and May 1746, the Mysore army was active in Malabar, supporting the chief of Pālghāṭ against the Zāmorin of Calicut. A letter, dated October 24, 1745,[103] refers to "the war the Samorine [Zāmorin] was engaged in with the King of Mysure [Mysore], between whose forces there had lately been a great battle near Pallycata-cherry [Pālghāṭ-chērry], in which the Samorine got the better and obliged the Mysure army to retreat two leagues." Another, dated November 3,[104] speaks of the Zāmorin's "war with an ally [chief of Pālghāṭ] of the King of Meysure's, with whom they have had three battles, in the first of which the Samorine had the victory but lost the others and eighty men." A third,

101. *Impl. Gaz.*, XVII. 57.
102. *Telli. Cons.* (1737-1738), p. 52: *Consultation* dated December 26, 1737; (1745-1746), pp. 20, 26-30, etc.: *Consultations* dated September 27 and October 5-9, 1745.
103. *Ibid* (1745-1746), p. 42: *Consultation* dated October 28, 1745.
104. *Ibid*, p. 51: *Consultation* dated November 4, 1745.

dated December 7,[105] refers to the illness of the Zāmorin and "the ill-success of the war with the King of Meysure." On February 6, 1746, the Zāmorin died.[106] Hostilities with Mysore continued under his successor who, in a letter received at Tellicherry on May 23, 1746,[107] writes of the king of Mysore as having despatched a body of horse and foot towards Pālghāṭ and ravaged his country, and of his (Zāmorin's) having sent his officers and troops to put them to rout; and speaks of the expedition as having entailed a heavy expense on him, preventing the payment of his dues to the English.

Third phase: 1746-1748.

In 1746, Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar, as mentioned already, attained his majority and was wedded to Dēvājamma, daughter of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya. From hence, Nanjarājaiya began to play a leading rôle in the affairs of Mysore as the junior Daḷavāi, his elder brother Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya, already advanced in age, having retired from active military life and taken up the direction of the revenue and finances of the kingdom.[108]

General political situation, 1745-1748.

Meanwhile political situation in the Karnāṭak and the Deccan had been tending towards a crisis. Since the repulse of Bābū Nāyak, the Mahratta *sardār*, in 1745, considerable disorder prevailed in central and northern Karnāṭak (*Bālaghāṭ*) where Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn's authority was little recognised. With the exception of the *subāh* of Sīra under Nawāb Dilāvar Khān, successor of Tāhir Khān (since *c.* 1740), there was practically no master over a greater part of the country from the Tungabhadra up to the limits of the kingdom of Mysore.[109] The settlement of this tract and keeping the Pēshwa in touch with its affairs—as a delegate of Shāhu from Satāra—was

105. *Ibid*, p. 75: *Consultation* dated December 10, 1745.
106. *Ibid*, p. 110: *Consultation* dated February 7, 1746.
107. *Ibid*, p. 167: *Consultation* dated May 23, 1746.
108. *Vide* references cited in Ch. XII; see also and compare *Wilks*, I. 259.
109. *Sel. Pesh. Daft.*, Vol. XXV, *Letter* No. 29 dated September 29, 1746.

Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya, Daḷavāi and Regent of Mysore, 1739-1759.

engaging the attention of the Mahrattas encamped in this region.[110] Between 1745-1747 Bābū Nāyak was again active in the Karnāṭak. Early in 1747, his agent Śankrāji-Pant, proceeding from Hanumanta-sāgar, took possession of the forts of Bēgūr and Yeliyūr with the help of the Bēḍas ("Berads").[111] Bābū Nāyak had had his eye on Seringapatam also,[112] but, hard pressed as he was by the forces of Anwar-ud-dīn and his allies (*i.e.*, the Ghōrpaḍes, the Nawāb of Sīra and Mysore), he was obliged to retire from the Karnāṭak (May 19, 20).[113] Almost simultaneously (March-May 1747), Nāsir Jang, appointed as Nawāb of the Karnāṭak, was on his way to the south, armed with full authority by his father Nizām-ul-mulk to collect alleged arrears of contribution (*pēshkāsh*) from Arcot, Sīra, Mysore and Tanjore among other places.[114] Early in October 1747, having partially succeeded in his object, he hastily retraced his steps, alarmed by news of his father's illness at Aurangābād.[115] On June 19, 1748, Nizām-ul-mulk died.[116]

Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya's expedition to Dhārānagar, c. May-July 1746.

About the middle of 1746, Nanjarājaiya proceeded on an expedition to Dhārānagar (Dhārāpur, in the present Coimbatore district) in the south-east. A pretender, set up by the turbulent elements, had occupied

110. *Ibid.*

111. *Ibid*, Vol. XXVIII, *Letter* No. 42 (*c.* February 1747?). Bēgūr and Yeliyūr are places situated in Dēvanahaḷḷi taluk, Bangalore district (see *List of Villages*, 11-12). Hanumanta-sāgar is a village in Nelamangala taluk (*Ibid*, 17). The text actually refers to Bēgūr and Yēliyūr as "Bedoor and Yeloor in the territory of Shrirangapaṭan."

112. *Ibid*; see also f.n. 113 *infra*.

113. *Ibid*, Vol. XXV, *Letter* No. 65 dated May 27, 1747. The Mahratta reverses of May 1747 are, perhaps, further echoed in the *Mys. Rāj. Cha.* (43) when it speaks of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya as having repulsed with heavy loss Futte Singh and Bābū Rao (Bābū Nāyak), on their approach to Seringapatam.—If we are to accept this source, then the repulse referred to must be held to have occurred shortly after Nanjarājaiya's successful termination of the siege of Dēvanahaḷḷi (April 29, 1747), described below.

114. *Di. A. Pi.*, III. 432, IV. 6, 44, 70, 125, etc.

115. *Ibid*, IV. 168.

116. *Wilks*, I. 285-286 (*Editorial note*).

the town and was harassing the inhabitants.[117] Nanjarājaiya put him down with a strong hand and, restoring order, returned to Seringapatam by the end of July,[118] in time to face the situation at Dēvanahaḷḷi (in the present Bangalore district).

His siege of Dēvanahaḷḷi, *c.* August 1746-April 1747.

Profiting by the unsettled conditions of the times in the Karnāṭak, Range-Gauḍa, the Morasa chief of Doḍbaḷḷāpur, had taken possession of Dēvanahaḷḷi (*Dēvaṇapura*) with the aid of the Mahratta and Mughal troopers, and become a source of trouble to his neighbours.[119] Early in August, Nanjarājaiya marched on thither at the head of a strong contingent.[120] At Bangalore he was joined by a detachment under Śābās Sāhib and his younger brother Haidar Alī Khān, then serving under Katti Gōpālarāja Urs.[121] Dēvanahāḷḷi was closely besieged by the Mysoreans for nearly nine months (*c.* August 1746-April 1747).[122] And they were assisted also by the allies of Nawāb Anwar-ud-dīn, namely, Subhau Rao-Ghōrpaḍe, brother of Murāri Rao-Ghōrpaḍe, and Dilāvar Khān of Sīra, at the head of 700 and 1,000 horse respectively.[123] To prevent the Mahrattas from making common cause with Range-Gauḍa and frustrate

117. *Kakud. Māhāt.*, I, 10; also *Nanjarājayaśas. Cham.*, III, ff. 13-18. For details about these works, *vide* under *Literary activity* in Ch. XIII.

118. *Ibid*; see also and compare *Mys. Rāj. Cha.*, 43, and *Wilks*, I. 259.

119. *Kakud. Māhāt.*, I, 11; see also and compare *Haid. Nām.* (ff. 2-3), which refers to the chief as Nārāyaṇa-Gauḍa, perhaps another name of Range-Gauḍa.

120. *Ibid*, 12-13; *Haid. Nām.*, ff. 2.

121. For particulars about Haidar's services on the occasion, *vide* under *Early career and rise of Haidar Alī* in Ch. X below.

122. *Haid. Nām.*, ff. 3; *Sel. Pesh. Daft.*, Vol. XXV, *Letter* No. 65, and Vol. XXVIII, *Letter* No. 42—cited in f.n. 113 and 111 *supra*. According to these sources, the siege of Dēvanahaḷḷi lasted for about nine months during *Akshaya* and *Prabhava* (1746-1747). See also f.n. 126 *infra*. The *Annals* (I. 178) places the event roughly in 1746 (*Akshaya*). Wilks (I. 261) and Dēvachandra (*Rāj. Kath.*, XII. 490), however, assign the siege to 1749, for which there is no evidence.

123. *Sel. Pesh. Daft.*, l.c.

their getting a permanent foothold in the north of Seringapatam, became the common objectives of the confederates. Nevertheless, the Gauḍa defended himself gallantly against the combination, and sought reinforcements from the Mahratta general Bābū Nāyak, then active in the Karnāṭak.[124] Bābū despatched 2,000 horse to the succour of Dēvanahaḷḷi,[125] but, on April 29, 1747, even before the arrival of this detachment, Nanjarājaiya had succeeded in taking the fort.[126] Range-Gauḍa was captured and deprived of all power.[127] He concluded a truce (*kaulu*) with Mysore, by which he managed to obtain his release.[128] Eventually he went over to his cousin at Chikballāpur;[129] Dēvanahaḷḷi was absorbed in the kingdom of Mysore, and Nanjarājaiya returned to Seringapatam, where he was, as a mark of this exploit, honoured with the emblems of Hanuma and Śarābha standards (*Kapidhvaja, Śarabhāṅkita-dhvaja*) by king Krishṇarāja.[130]

Renewed Mughal advance on Mysore.

Nāsir Jang in Seringapatam, July-October, 1747.

In July 1747, hardly two months after Nanjarājaiya's return from Dēvanahaḷḷi, Nāsir Jang appeared with his army before Seringapatam, demanding payment of alleged arrears of contribution due.[131] Even earlier, about March, his father Nizām-ul-mulk, we learn, had pretended to lease out Seringapatam for rupees seventy lakhs,[132] and the king of Mysore apprised "that in default of payment of the amount, not only would it be collected by force, but the province would be laid waste in such manner as the Nizām might think fit."[133] Nāsir Jang's demand,

124. *Ibid*, Vol. XXV, *Letter* No. 65, cited *supra*. 125. *Ibid*.
126. *Ibid*. The actual date on which the fort was taken by the Seringapatam forces was, according to this contemporary source, *Prabhava, Vaiśākha śu.* 1 (April 29, 1747).
127. *Kakud. Māhāt.*, I, 14.
128. *Haid. Nām.*, l.c.; also *Kakud. Māhāt.*, l.c.; cf. *Annals, Rāj. Kath., Mys. Rāj. Cha.* and *Wilks*, l.c.
129. *Ibid*. 130. *Kakud. Māhāt.*, I, 15.
131. *Di. A. Pi.*, IV. 125, 131: *Notes* dated July 18 and 29, 1747.
132. *Ibid*, III. 432: *Notes* dated March ? 1747. 133. *Ibid*.

however, did not meet with any response, and the country was ordered to be ravaged.[134] Thereupon the authorities at Seringapatam conducted negotiations for nearly two months.[135] Nāsir Jang, in the meanwhile, is said[136] to have encamped at Toṇṇūr, not far from Seringapatam, and amused himself on the large tank there, giving it the name of *Mōti-Talāb* ("Lake of Pearls"), which it still retains. Ultimately, in or about October, he was bought off for twenty-one lakhs, and retired.[137]

The short-lived Hindu reaction in Southern India, 1748.

The death of the Nizām in June 1748 seemed immediately to affect his ambitious scheme of bringing the whole of the Karnāṭak and Southern India under his control as the Mughal Vizier of the Deccan, and to have its own repercussions on those regions. Indeed, while it threw open the south to the Mahrattas, it tended for a time to keep alive the movement for the revival of Hindu rule in Trichinopoly under Vijaya-Kumāra, son of Bangāru-Tirumala (of the Nāyaka family of Madura), a movement in which Mysore was, as usual, equally interested. For, on August 5, 1748, news was afloat that[138] "the Marathas are marching with 10,000 horse through Mysore. The people of Tanjore and Mysore, the Tondiman and the Maravan went to recover Trichinopoly from the Muhammadans and establish there Kattu Rāja's son. Srimushnam, Vriddhachalam and other places are to be added to Tanjore, and the territories lately conquered by the Muhammadans are to

134. *Ibid*, IV. 131 : l.c.

135. *Ibid*, IV. 131, 168 and 175: *Notes* dated July 29, and October 11 and 20, 1747. At first, it was reported, "thirty lakhs of rupees" were offered as against Nāsir's demand of "fifty lakhs of pagodas"; then it was reduced to "twenty-five lakhs"; and finally to "twenty-one lakhs".

136. *Wilks*, I. 260.

137. *Di. A. Pi.*, IV. 175: l.c.; cf. *Mys. Rāj. Cha.*, l.c.; *Rāj. Kath.*, XII. 489-490; and *Wilks*, I. 259-260.

138. *Ibid*, V. 176: *Notes* dated August 5, 1748.

be restored to their former owners. They are raising troops to attack Trichinopoly." Again, on the 12th of the same month, it was circulated that[139] "the Maravas, the people of Tanjore, Mysore and others, joining together, mean to release Ramanayyan, Konappayyan's son, who is in prison at Tanjore, and capture the fort of Trichinopoly." By the 18th, however, we are told,[140] nothing was heard "about the plan of the above peoples against Trichinopoly." Evidently the movement seems to have slowly receded to the background under the stress of the crisis that was being rapidly reached in Southern India about this time.

139. *Ibid*, 192: *Notes* dated August 12, 1748.
140. *Ibid*, 210: *Notes* dated August 18, 1748.